



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/763,864	05/23/2001	Masahide Sato	204060US	3525
22850	7590	07/14/2004	EXAMINER	
OBLOON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				SERRER, CURTIS EDWARD
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		

1761
DATE MAILED: 07/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/763,864	SATO ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Curtis E. Sherrer, Esq.	1761	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05/18/04.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 9-37 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 11, 12, 18-20, 22, 24, and 29-32 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 9,10,13-17,21,23,25-28 and 33-37 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9, 10, 13-17, 21, 23, 25-28 and 33-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sapporo Breweries (Jap. Pat. No. 6197749) ("Sapporo") in view of Szlavko (Jnl. of Amer. Soc. of Brewing Chemists, 34 (2) pp. 59-60, 1976) for the reasons set forth in the last Office action.

Response to Arguments

Applicants' arguments filed 05/16/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that Sapporo does not teach the use of beads. While the patent and its machine translation (herein attached) do not use the term "bead" in connection with the method by which the yeast are fixed, it is clear that beads are in fact produced and used. On page 2, in the example, of the translation, the yeast are immobilized in cells after the yeast and gelling material are expelled from a double pipe.

Applicants also argue that the use of non-flocculant yeast results in benefits not appreciated by the prior art. In response to applicants' argument, the fact that applicants have recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the

suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

Lastly, applicants assert that the improvements obtained by using non-flocculant yeast are shown by the specification's data. It appears from the data, that the asserted benefits are obtained from two specific strains of non-flocculant yeast, i.e., NA-3 and NA-4. The claims are not commensurate in scope for the use of these two yeasts, e.g., the claims are not enabled for providing the asserted benefits for any and all non-flocculant yeast.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Curtis E. Sherrer, Esq. whose telephone number is 571-272-1406. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday, 8AM-6:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on 571-272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Curtis E. Sherrer, Esq.

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1761